

tions on wooden planks came with him, and was followed for a considerable time. When Palladio appeared, everything in Italy was encouraging. He was sought for and patronised by the great merchant princes, and the most dignified ecclesiastics. Palaces and villas were building in all directions, and of his works it may be said Palladian art combines all that is magnificent in the proportions. At the age of thirty he established himself at Vicenza, where, in competition with such men as Julio Romano and others, he triumphed by the erection of the famous theatre in that city. At the age of ages, when he says he was looking forward to a more glorious world, he published those models we find in his admirable work. His four precious books are useful to all generations. He designed a restoration of the Forum (of which a drawing was exhibited) with the Temple of Nerva at the extremity. This temple was then existing, but has since been destroyed. Its Greek portico he united to the other lateral erections by arches, which may be objected to for not being trabecate; but it had lately been adopted at the New Exchange, in Glasgow, and was said to have a very beautiful effect. The use of the arch was indispensable in building: its union with the Greek orders was achieved by the Roman architects, and carried to the highest perfection for modern purposes by Palladio. His writings might be called the Holy Writ of architecture. Like Herodotus and Sir Christopher Wren, he asserts and reasons upon every point, but may be said, nevertheless, to be often throwing pearls to swine. He treats of the orders of arches: the orders of arches will be dilated on in a succeeding lecture, as a subject deserving intense consideration, although the very term of it was scarcely received. Chapters 21, 22, 23, and 24, treated of the proportions of rooms, a subject hitherto quite overlooked among us, but now of great importance; for, with the better feeling of the age, we were not forced to build butches such as suited our ancestors. Staircases were also treated in this book. In the second book, houses and villas form the contents; for the epoch of Palladio was not a church-building age: the merchant princes of Italy loved to build palaces worthy of their taste and fortunes. Forty-five examples of them are in this book. The third book treated of roads and bridges. The fourth book contained ninety-nine plates, illustrative of the temples of Rome: fifteen of these in the city, the greater number of which have been since destroyed, and eleven temples out of Rome. There have been three English editions of Palladio: one is by Leoni, who built Anglesey House, in Burlington-gardens. This mansion had the remarkable features of the façade being constructed with nine pilasters—an odd number not admitted in the orthodox rules, and probably never noticed by the greater number of living architects, although it had a very excellent effect. The most splendid edition, however, was the one published by B. Scamozzi, which was well worthy of the subject. So much for Palladio, that great and illustrious man.

Vignola is the next writer to be commented on. He was much encouraged by Francis I. of France, who knew how to congregate all men of talent about him. Vignola's book treats only of the five orders, and is practically useful, although his entablatures are much too heavy. He first gave the true rules for forming the entasis of columns, and was certainly a man of extraordinary merit. His name has been used for an abundance of small works treating of the first principles of Greek and Roman architecture. Scamozzi, who followed, had great merit, but not comparable at all in the Palladian style. His book is called "Universal Architecture of all known Scenes in the World!" From his exceeding boasting, Inigo Jones refers to him as Signor Bragadoccio. In his will he imagines the universal affliction his death would cause, but consoles himself that his works will preserve his name to all eternity, and gives directions for a monument to be erected to the memory of "such a man as he."

No one approached Palladio like Inigo Jones. His design for the palace of Whitehall is be-

yond all praise. The only part we possess, the Banqueting House, is universally admired by architects of all countries. He left only MSS. notes, which are preserved in Oxford, on Palladio, and on Stonehenge. The first are valuable to the student: those on Stonehenge display the vanity of Jones, and paint him a bit of a coxcomb: herein he exhibits a sad ignorance of history and antiquity. As Jones had the arrangement of the masques and similar entertainments at the court of James I. he had an excellent opportunity of indulging his fancy in the architectural scenic decorations. Dramatic scenery affords great play for the imagination and for study. Servandoni, who built St. Sulpice, at Paris, was a scene-painter. Next in rotation is F. Blondel, a very accomplished architect, whose fame as an original genius is fully established by the truly beautiful Porte St. Denis and Porte St. Martin at Paris. His book on architecture is divided into five parts: there is an ungracious absence of his great contemporaries in his work, as he never names either Sir C. Wren, who had then greatly advanced with St. Paul's, or his own talented countryman, Perrault. The first book treats of the orders, as received by the great masters, and in true ancient monuments. The second book treats of the parts, and especially of the composite. The third is occupied with the peristyle and intercolumniations. The fourth treats of openings, such as doors, windows, arcades, and arches, especially the two remarkable ones erected by him, before named, in which there is an originality never attained in classical times. The fifth book contains optics and perspective. These five books are remarkable, as no similarly elaborate work had before been composed. Sir William Chambers wrote an elegant work: the student is always safe in the hands of Chambers, whatever be the fashion of the times. In the Professor's early days, architects were devout Greeks: now Romish Catholic art is the fashion for a term of time only. It is not by fashion, but by great monuments that an epoch is typified. Adams followed Chambers, but they emancipated art and made it feminine. Athenian Stuart and Walpole opened new veins: the remains of art in Greece were worthy of adoration, but they were fitted to the climate and position. The Parthenon or the Acropolis had a majestic base, which would have made it ridiculous if built in a swamp. The glorious Doric was at Athens on a fitting site. It were equally ridiculous to adapt the Gothic of churches to hotels, bazaars, and similar buildings. Gothic was now in the ascendant, but the rage for mimicking it would soon pass away. Youth follows blindly, but at mature age we criticise and reflect. The problem we have to solve is by the cultivation of the mind, which is the certain index of an artist's capacity to emancipate himself from routine and to become a distinguished ornament of his profession.

In conclusion: of the high importance of the architect, he would mention that of Blondel, quoting Holy Writ, where he said "*pour comble de malheur*," the loss of the architect was expressly bewailed. The passage is in Isaiah iii. 3.

TESTIMONIAL TO DR. CONOLLY.—Some of our readers will be glad to learn that the promised subscriptions now amount to more than 600*l*. The committee have decided to have Dr. Conolly's portrait painted by Sir John Watson Gordon, for which purpose Dr. C. proceeds forthwith to Edinburgh. They have further determined to limit the outlay on the painting and engraving to 400*l*. in order to have a residue sufficient to obtain a handsome piece of plate, with an inscription. The list is still open, and Dr. Forbes, of Old Burlington-street, will gladly receive fresh subscriptions. Never was a testimonial more truly deserved.

WINDOW FOR ST. LUKE'S, CHELSEA.—Some of the inhabitants of St. Luke's, Chelsea, having long been desirous of seeing a stained glass window at the east end of the parish church, a subscription has been commenced for that purpose, and Mr. Gibbs has furnished a design.

ARCHITECTURE AND THE EXHIBITION

THE clever author of the "Historical Inquiry into the Principles of Beauty in Art," has, it seems to me, misrepresented, in his letter to you last week, both Mr. Barry and the art he professes.

Mr. Barry (in common with other architects), it is said or implied, "*could not*" furnish what was wanted for the Hyde-park Exhibition,—because, being an architect, his rule (like other architects) was "*to copy*."

Will the author of this discovery be kind enough to show us in what respect Mr. Barry (and modern architects in general) have copied more than Mr. Paxton? or more than the ancient and mediæval artists who (the author tells us) followed the same principles and nothing more? Will he show us how or wherein Ictinus (for instance) copied less from the Doric of others,—or William of Wykeham less from the Gothic of others,—or Mr. Paxton less from the greenhouses, the columns, the girders of others,—than Mr. Barry from the architecture of others? If Mr. Fergusson will only do this, will only descend from sweeping generalities to particular instances, and show us examples of what he calls "*copyism*" in Mr. Barry's works, or in modern architecture at large; I will undertake, for every one such instance, to find him two analogous ones in ancient architecture, and two more in modern engineering.

That William of Wykeham and Charles Barry and J. Paxton represent three totally distinct arts, working on fundamentally different principles, none is more ready to maintain than I; but that the word "*copyism*" affords any test to distinguish them, I must deny. If Mr. Fergusson will but give it a fair trial, he will find it apply in any sense that is not wholly new just as much and just as little, to one or another of the three things—Old Architecture, New Architecture, or Engineering. We builders have long harped upon the word as though we thought it the *Sesame* to open the whole labyrinth of our difficulties; but it is not the golden key: we must look for another.

Meanwhile, allow me to state what seem to me the plain common-sense reasons for what Mr. Fergusson thinks such a pity,—that neither Mr. Barry, nor any other architect, erected the exhibition-house. Firstly, because he was not asked to do so; secondly, because it was not his business; and thirdly, because it was so much beneath his business, that no real architect could be expected to stoop to it, and none would have done so had he known what would be wanted. The country supposing, at first, that it wanted a work of architecture, invited the architects of Europe to make their suggestions; whereupon those who were "*green*" enough (chiefly foreigners with little knowledge of English character) did so. We then discovered that we did not want a work of architecture or at least could not have one, because (among other reasons) there was not time, while the designs hung to ascertain the practicality or feasibility of any one of them—I mean any one of those that were real architecture, for of course the majority were only sham palaces or sham temples, the majority of modern art necessarily consisting of shams. Well, then, seeing we had no time for architecture, and no more wanted than the fox did the grapes; seeing we had, like him, mistaken what we wanted, and that the 200 architects had paid for our mistakes, I congratulated them, and bade to woe they will be wiser next time; seeing we now wanted not architecture but a rickety box;—not the most excellent structure we could contrive for a given purpose with given means, but the easiest to fulfil certain conditions,—that most easily proved practicable,—most easily calculated,—and capable of answering its material ends with least expenditure of thought,—thus being what was now wanted, Mr. Paxton had the merit of seeing that it was so, and proposing one way of doing it; and as this was the only way proposed, or the only one that there was time to consider, it has been pierced and patched into what may possibly answer the end. But no architect proposed a way, or